

**MADL PA**

Christopher W. Madel, MN Reg. No. 230297

Jennifer M. Robbins, MN Reg. No. 387745

Cassandra B. Merrick, MN Reg. No. 396372

800 Hennepin Avenue

800 Pence Building

Minneapolis, MN 55403

Telephone: 612-605-0630

Facsimile: 612-326-9990

cmadel@madellaw.com

jrobbins@madellaw.com

cmerrick@madellaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendant Portfolio Recovery  
Associates, LLC*

**U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**IN RE PORTFOLIO  
RECOVERY ASSOCIATES,  
LLC TELEPHONE  
CONSUMER PROTECTION  
ACT LITIGATION**

Case No.: 11-MD-02295-JAH-  
BGS

**NOTICE OF  
SUPPLEMENTAL  
AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT  
OF DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION FOR STAY**

This Document Relates to All  
Member Cases

Defendant Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC ("PRA") submits the following supplemental authority in support of its Motion to Stay (Dkt. 777): (1) *Seefeldt v. Entm't Consulting Int'l, LLC*, No. 4:19-CV-00188, 2020 WL 905844 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 25, 2020) (order attached hereto); (2) *Wright v. eXp Realty, LLC*, No. 6:18-CV-1851-ORL-40EJK, 2020 WL 1149906 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 7, 2020)

1 (order attached hereto); and (3) *Perrong v. Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.*, 1:18-cv-  
2 00712-MN (D. Del. Mar. 6, 2020) (docket report attached hereto).

3 In *Seefeldt*, the court granted Defendants’ motion for a stay pending  
4 resolution by the U.S. Supreme Court of *Barr v. American Association of*  
5 *Political Consultants*, Appeal No. 19-631, on the basis of not only the  
6 government-debt issue, but also the Telephone Consumer Protection Act’s  
7 “definitional problem of what constitutes an autodialer.” *Id.* at \*3. The *Seefeldt*  
8 court noted:

9 [T]he problem of continuing this case is laid bare: it hinges not only on the  
10 problem of the government-debt exception, but also on the definitional  
11 problem of what constitutes an autodialer. To be sure, this Court notes  
12 plaintiff’s complaint seems to specifically rely on the autodialer definition  
13 adopted by the Ninth Circuit—that is, an autodialer that can simply “store  
14 telephone numbers to be called, regardless of whether those numbers were  
15 generate by a random or sequential number generator”—which now sits in  
16 a clear appellate minority as against the greater weight of the Third,  
17 Seventh, and Eleventh Circuits.

16 *Id.*

17 Similarly, the court in *Wright* determined “that any proceedings before the  
18 Supreme Court issues guidance in the upcoming *Barr v. Am. Ass’n* will be—  
19 among other things—a waste of judicial resources and a waste of the parties’  
20 time and energy.” 2020 WL 1149906, at \*1 (M.D. Fla. Feb. 7, 2020).

21 Finally, on March 6, 2020, by a minute order, the *Perrong* court also  
22 stayed that matter pending resolution of the *Barr* appeal. *Perrong v. Liberty*  
23 *Power Corp, L.L.C.*, 1:18-cv-00712-MN (D. Del. Mar. 6, 2020) (Docket Entry).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED: March 23, 2020

**MADL PA**

2  
3 By: s/ *Cassandra B. Merrick*

4 Christopher W. Madel (230297)

5 Jennifer M. Robbins (0387745)

6 Cassandra B. Merrick (396372)

7 800 Pence Building

8 800 Hennepin Avenue

9 Minneapolis, MN 55403

10 Telephone: 612-605-0630

11 Fax: 612-326-9990

12 cmadel@madellaw.com

13 jrobbins@madellaw.com

14 cmerrick@madellaw.com

15 **Attorneys for Defendant**

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Cassandra B. Merrick, counsel for Defendants, hereby certify that service of the foregoing NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR STAY was filed electronically through the CM/ECF system to the following:

Amanda J. Allen

Amanda@theconsumerprotectionfirm.com

Rex C. Anderson

mied@rexandersonpc.com

Seth Andrews

sandrews@kennethhiller.com

David N. Anthony

David.anthony@troutmansanders.com

Randy Jiro Aoyama

raoyama@hinshawlaw.com

Mauricio Arcadier

office@wamalaw.com; arcadier@wamalaw.com

Michael Ronald Ayers

mayers@hinshawlaw.com

Paul Mathew Bach

paul@bachoffices.com

Penelope N. Bach

pnbach@sulaimanlaw.com

Adrian R. Bacon

abacon@attorneysforconsumers.com

Mohammed Omar Badwan

1 mbadwan@sulaimanlaw.com  
2 Stephen J. Bagge  
3 sbagge@cfjblaw.com  
4 Avanti Deepak Bakane  
5 abakane@gordonrees.com  
6 Phillip T. Barrett  
7 pbarrett@gordonrees.com  
8 Keith J. Barnett  
9 Keith.barnett@sutherland.com  
10 Michael T. Berger  
11 mberger@hinshawlaw.com  
12 Scott C. Borison  
13 usdc@legglaw.com  
14 Brian Lewis Bromberg  
15 brian@bromberglawoffice.com;  
16 jonathan@bromberglawoffice.com;  
17 brian.bromberg@gmail.com  
18 Maxie Broome Jr.  
19 mbroomelaw@aol.com  
20 Lauren M. Burnette  
21 lmburnette@mdwcg.com  
22 Floyd W. Bybee  
23 Floyd@bybeelaw.com  
24 Clifford Alva Phillip Carlson  
25 cc@cliffcarlsonlaw.com  
26 Gus M Centrone  
27 gcentrone@centroneshrader.com  
28

1 Hyung Sik Choi  
2 hyung@choiandfabian.com  
3 Jennifer M. Spiegel Colson  
4 jcolson@jennifercolsonpa.com  
5 Cathleen M. Combs  
6 ccombs@edcombs.com  
7 Timothy Condon  
8 tim@timcondon.net  
9 Lindsey A.L. Conley  
10 lconley@hinshawlaw.com  
11 Maximiliano D. Couvillier, III  
12 mcouvillier@blacklobellolaw.com  
13 Edward C. Cutlip, Jr  
14 ecutlip@kerr-russell.com  
15 Marwan R. Daher  
16 mdaher@sulainanlaw.com  
17 Ronald E. Daniels  
18 ron@dlawllc.com  
19 James Lee Davidson  
20 jdavidson@gdrlawfirm.com; jjohnson@gdrlawfirm.com  
21 Joseph S. Davidson  
22 jdavidson@sulaimanlaw.com  
23 Marissa I. Delinks  
24 mdelinks@hinshawlaw.com  
25 Deirdre O. Dexter  
26 dexter@barrowgrimm.com  
27 Joshua C. Dickinson  
28

1 jdickinson@spencerfane.com  
2 John C. Distasio  
3 jdistasio@forthepeople.com  
4 Thomas R. Dominczyk  
5 trd@mnlawpc.com  
6 Holly Elizabeth Dowd  
7 hollyedowd@yahoo.com  
8 Chad Vinson Echols  
9 chad.echols@theecholsfirm.com  
10 Daniel A. Edelman,  
11 dedelman@edcombs.com, courtecl@edcombs.com  
12 Caren D. Enloe  
13 cenloe@smithdebnamlaw.com; jroach@smithdebnamlaw.com  
14 Veronika Fabian  
15 veronika@choiandfabian.com  
16 Lawrence A. Farese  
17 lafarese@rkmc.com  
18 Andrew Jay Feldman  
19 Andrew@swattslaw.com  
20 Barbara Fernandez,  
21 bfernandez@hinshawlaw.com  
22 Glenn M. Fjermedal  
23 gfjermedal@davidsonfink.com  
24 Monica L. Haddad Forbes  
25 mforbes@mcguirewoods.com  
26 Brett Freeman  
27 bfecf@bankruptcypa.com  
28

1 Rachel R Friedman  
2 rfriedman@burr.com  
3 Todd M. Friedman  
4 tfriedman@attorneysforconsumers.com; abacon@toddfaw.com;  
5 ecompany@toddfaw.com;  
6 Erika.campay@gmail.com; mgeorge@toddfaw.com;  
7 twheeler@toddfaw.com; yoel.hanohov@toddfaw.com;  
8 nadia.lotun@toddfaw.com; paralegal5@toddfaw.com  
9 Todd Friedman  
10 Todd.friedman@kirkland.com  
11 William John Gadd  
12 wjg@mazgadd.com  
13 James Patrick Galvin  
14 james@twbglaw.com  
15 Joseph P. Garin  
16 nvecf@lipsonneilson.com  
17 John Philip Gaset  
18 jgaset@broadandcassel.com  
19 Michael A. Geibelson  
20 mgeibelson@robinskaplan.com; lbryant-wilson@robinskaplan.com;  
21 sduenas@robinskaplan.com  
22 Amanda Lyn Genovese  
23 Amanda.genovese@troutmansanders.com  
24 Hans Germann  
25 hgermann@mayerbrown.com  
26 Amy Lynn Bennecoff Ginsburg  
27 aginsburg@creditlaw.com; teamkimmel@creditlaw.com  
28



1 Jeremy M Glapion  
2 jmg@glapionlaw.com  
3 Bert Thomas Golden  
4 btg@bthomasgolden.com  
5 Octavio Gomez  
6 tgomez@forthepeople.com  
7 Tara Leigh Goodwin  
8 tgoodwin@edcombs.com  
9 Jessica A. Green  
10 jgreen@lipsonneilson.com  
11 Francis Richard Greene  
12 fgreene@edcombs.com; courtecl@edcombs.com; jgalindo@edcombs.com  
13 Michael Lewis Greenwald  
14 mgreenwald@gdrlawfirm.com; jdavidson@gdrlawfirm.com;  
15 aradbil@gdrlawfirm.com  
16 Rami Nicola Haddad  
17 rnhaddad@portfoliorecovery.com  
18 James J. Haller  
19 Belleville@tbcwam.com  
20 David Palmer Hartnett  
21 dhartnett@hinshawlaw.com  
22 Brian J. Headley  
23 bjheadley@yahoo.com  
24 Patrick J. Helwig  
25 phelwig@lawpoint.com  
26 Kevin Hernandez  
27 khernandez@blacklobellolaw.com; Kevin@kevinhernandezlaw.com

1 Adam Theodore Hill  
2 ahill@consumerlawcenter.com  
3 Samuel M. Hill  
4 sam@samhilllaw.com; pang@samhilllaw.com; chris@samhilllaw.com  
5 Kenneth R. Hiller  
6 khiller@kennethhiller.com  
7 Sara F. Holladay-Tobias  
8 sfhollad@mcguirewoods.com  
9 Peter A. Holland  
10 peter@hollandlawfirm.com  
11 Kersten Holzhueter  
12 kholzhueter@spencerfane.com  
13 Shireen Hormozdi  
14 shormozdi@consumerlawcenter.com  
15 Nathan L. Horton  
16 nhorton@portfoliorecovery.com  
17 William Peerce Howard  
18 whoward@forthepeople.com  
19 Tammy Gruder Hussin  
20 tammy@hussinlaw.com; cjohnson@hussinlaw.com  
21 Wedad Ibrahim  
22 wedadi@michiganconsumerlaw.com  
23 Brian Johnson  
24 bj@kcconsumerlawyer.com  
25 Lira A. Johnson  
26 Lira.johnson@dinslaw.com  
27 Matthew Brady Johnson  
28

1 mbjohnson@mdwcg.com  
2 Joshua R. Kersey  
3 JKersey@ForThePeople.com  
4 Stephen W. King  
5 sking@kingandmurray.com  
6 David H. Krieger  
7 dkrieger@hainesandkrieger.com  
8 James O. Lattuner  
9 jlattuner@edcombs.com; courtecl@edcombs.com  
10 Jared Michael Lee  
11 jlee@forthepeople.com; jmlpleadings@forthepeople.com;  
12 jsharpe@forthepeople.com; mhoilett@forthepeople.com;  
13 mrathbun@forthepeople.com  
14 Julia Veronica Lee  
15 jvlee@rkmc.com  
16 Alan Daniel Leeth  
17 aleeth@burr.com; sfoshee@burr.com  
18 David B. Leibowitz  
19 dleibowitz@uprightlaw.com  
20 Sergei Lemberg  
21 slemberg@leberglaw.com; cdemaio@leberglaw.com  
22 Patric A. Lester  
23 pl@lesterlaw.com  
24 Ryan S. Lett  
25 rlett@fbtlaw.com  
26 David B. Levin  
27 dlevin@toddlaw.com  
28

1 Kevin L. Lewis

2 kevin@floridalloanlawyers.com

3 Vitaly Libman

4 vlibman@hinshawlaw.com

5 Donald S. Litman

6 PA\_Law2@yahoo.com

7 Joseph C. LoTempio

8 jlotempio@dellutrilagroup.com

9 Bret Leon Lusskin, Jr

10 blusskin@lusskinlaw.com

11 Ian B. Lyngklip

12 ian@michiganconsumerlaw.com

13 David J.S. Madgett

14 dmadgett@madgettlaw.com

15 Robbie L. Malone

16 rmalone@rmalonelaw.com

17 Joseph R. Manning, Jr.

18 info@manninglawoffice.com

19 Michael John Manning

20 mike@manninglawoffice.com

21 Jeffrey David Mapes

22 jeff@mapesdebt.com

23 Ari Hillel Marcus

24 Ari@marcuszelman.com

25 Eugene Xerxes Martin, IV

26 xmartin@mamlaw.com; jayala@mamlaw.com; junger@mamlaw.com;

27 kmckinnon@mamlaw.com; nhernandez@mamlaw.com

1 Joseph Mauro  
2 JoeMauroesq@hotmail.com  
3 Karen L. Mayfield-Jones  
4 kamjones@portfoliorecovery.com  
5 Liana Mayilyan  
6 lmayilyan@snllp.com; ccogbill@snllp.com; paralegal@snllp.com  
7 Lara E. McGuire  
8 lara@theconsumerprotectionfirm.com  
9 Keith Steven McGurgan  
10 kmcgurgan@portfoliorecovery.com  
11 Marshall S. Meyers  
12 ECF@attorneysforconsumers.com; mmeyers@attorneysforconsumers.com  
13 Chris R. Miltenberger  
14 chris@crmlawpractice.com  
15 David Patrick Mitchell  
16 david@mitchellconsumerlaw.com; david@maneygordon.com;  
17 v.marrero@maneygordon.com  
18 Clayton S. Morrow  
19 cmorrow@allconsumerlaw.com  
20 Shilee T. Mullin  
21 smullin@spencerfane.com  
22 Robert W. Murphy  
23 rwmurphy@lawfirmmurphy.com  
24 Marilyn C. Naiman-Kohn  
25 mnk@simanlaw.net  
26 Philip Bao Nghiem  
27 philn@manninglawoffice.com  
28

1 Jeff Neuenschwander  
2 jeff@sllawfirm.com  
3 Anthony C. Norman  
4 Anthony@fight13.com  
5 Tearsa Storms Olson  
6 tolson@attorneysforconsumers.com  
7 Victoria Lea Orze  
8 vorze@dickinsonwright.com  
9 Ethan G. Ostroff  
10 Ethan.ostroff@troutmansanders.com  
11 Scott David Owens  
12 scott@scottdowens.com; Patrick@scottdowens.com;  
13 don@scottdowens.com; shannon@scottdowens.com;  
14 andree@scottdowen.com  
15 Katherine Lind Parker  
16 Katherine.parker@usdoj.gov; ginger.stacy@usdoj.gov;  
17 efile.dkt.civ@usdoj.gov; Leticia.adams@usdoj.gov  
18 Yvette.macias@usdoj.gov  
19 Benjamin A. Parker  
20 benparker@johnpricelawfirm.com; benparker416@gmail.com  
21 David George Peltan  
22 davidpeltan@peltanlaw.com  
23 Craig K. Perry  
24 craig@craigperry.com; info@1stoplawfirm.com  
25 Ryan D. Peterson  
26 rpeterson@madgettlaw.com  
27 Julie A. Petrik

1 Julie@michiganconsumerlaw.com  
2 William P. Pipal  
3 bill.pipal@troutmansanders.com  
4 Dominic M. Pontello  
5 dominicpontello@gmail.com  
6 Emily Prentice  
7 Emily.prentice@kattenlaw.com  
8 Jim Gerhart Price  
9 lawofficesofjgp@sbcglobal.net; deltalawgroup@yahoo.com  
10 Brandon J. Rafool  
11 bjr@brandonrafool.com  
12 Michael Rapp  
13 mr@kcconsumerlawyer.com  
14 Jason M. Renner  
15 Jason.renner@dinsmore.com  
16 Walt D. Roper  
17 walt@roperfirm.com  
18 Emily Yandle Rottman  
19 erottmann@mcguirewoods.com  
20 Carlo Sabatini  
21 ecf@bankruptcypa.com  
22 Syed Ali Saeed  
23 ali@sllawfirm.com  
24 David M. Schultz  
25 dschultz@hinshawlaw.com; courtfiling@hinshawlaw.com;  
26 jweller@hinshawlaw.com; izielinski@hinshawlaw.com  
27 Carl Schwartz  
28

1 carl@michiganconsumerlaw.com  
2 Nathan Andrew Searles  
3 nasearles@portfoliorecovery.com  
4 Felix Henri Sharpe, II  
5 felix.sharpe@dinsmore.com  
6 Brian L. Shrader  
7 bshrader@centroneshrader.com  
8 Robert E. Sickles  
9 rsickles@hinshawlaw.com  
10 Sundeep S. Sidhu  
11 sssidhu@portfoliorecovery.com  
12 Steven A. Siman  
13 sas@simanlaw.com  
14 Burke Smith  
15 Burke@burkesmithlaw.com  
16 George R. Smith, Jr.  
17 g.smith1961@att.net  
18 Robert Franklin Springfield  
19 fspringf@burr.com  
20 Scott Stamatakis  
21 service@myinjury.com  
22 Alan J. Stecklein  
23 aj@kcconsumerlawyer.com  
24 Brandon Stein  
25 bstein@hinshawlaw.com  
26 Kyle Steinmetz  
27 ksteinmetz@mayerbrown.com  
28



1 David A. Stella  
2 dstella@kerr-russell.com  
3 Max Story  
4 max@maxstorylaw.com  
5 Howard J. Strickland, Jr.  
6 Jay.strickland@jonescork.com  
7 Nathan D. Sturycz  
8 Nathan@swattslaw.com; shelly@swattslaw.com  
9 Ahmad Tayseer Sulaiman, First  
10 Ahmad.sulaiman@sulaimanlaw.com  
11 Omar Tayseer Sulaiiman  
12 osulaiman@sulaimanlaw.com  
13 Russell Snow Thompson, IV  
14 rthompson@attorneysforconsumers.com  
15 Jeffrey Alan Topor  
16 jtopor@snllp.com; ccogbill@snllp.com  
17 Emanwel Josef Turnbull  
18 eturnbull@hollandlawfirm.com  
19 Henry A. Turner  
20 hturner@tloffices.com; awallace@tloffices.com;  
21 Nicholas Wayne Tedford  
22 ntedford@craigzlaw.com  
23 Katherine Hannah Tresley  
24 ktresley@hinshawlaw.com  
25 Andrew T. Velonis  
26 andrewv@wzlaw.org  
27 Alexander S. Vesselinovitch  
28

1 avesselinovitch@kattenlaw.com

2 Michael J. Vitoria

3 mvitoria@forthepeople.com

4 Suren Weerasuriya

5 sweerasuriya@attorneysforconsumers.com

6 Lisa R. Wilcox

7 lwilcox@wilcoxlawpa.com

8 Steven R. Zahn

9 szahn@portfoliorecovery.com

10 Steven Zakharyayev

11 steven@floridalloanlawyers.com

12 Michael Andrew Ziegler

13 mike@zieglerlawoffice.com

14 Mary Catherine Zinsner

15 mary.zinsner@troutmansanders.com

17 DATED: March 23, 2020

**MADL PA**

19 By: s/ Cassandra B. Merrick

20 Cassandra B. Merrick (396372)

21 800 Pence Building

22 800 Hennepin Avenue

23 Minneapolis, MN 55403

24 Telephone: 612-605-0630

25 Fax: 612-326-9990

26 cmerrick@madellaw.com

**Attorney for Defendant**

2020 WL 905844

2020 WL 905844

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court,  
E.D. Missouri, Eastern Division.

Michael SEEFELDT, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiff,

v.

ENTERTAINMENT CONSULTING  
INTERNATIONAL, LLC., and Outfield Brew House,  
LLC. d/b/a Budweiser Brew House, Defendants.

Case No. 4:19-cv-00188

|  
Signed 02/25/2020

**Attorneys and Law Firms**

Anthony L. DeWitt, Bartimus and Frickleton, Jefferson City, MO, Edward D. Robertson, III, Kelly Clare Frickleton, Bartimus and Frickleton, Leawood, KS, Ari N. Rodopoulos, Peddicord and Townsend LLC, Kansas City, MO, for Plaintiff.

Geoffrey W. Castello, Glenn T. Graham, Pro Hac Vice, Lauri A. Mazzuchetti, Pro Hac Vice, Whitney M. Smith, Kelley and Drye, LLP, Parsippany, NJ, William James Foland, Jr., Jacqueline M. Sexton, Zachary T. Bowles, Foland Wickens, P.C., Kansas City, MO, for Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

STEPHEN N. LIMBAUGH, JR., UNITED STATES  
DISTRICT JUDGE

\*1 This matter comes before the Court on defendants' motion to stay (#93), which argues a stay is appropriate in this case pending resolution by the U.S. Supreme Court of *Barr v. American Association of Political Consultants*, Appeal No. 19-631. For the reasons that follow, that motion is **GRANTED**.

The case at hand involves a putative class action against defendants Entertainment Consulting International, LLC. ("ECI") and Outfield Brew House, LLC., d/b/a Budweiser Brew House ("Brew House"), alleging both "developed, acquired, licensed, and/or used custom, high-powered text-messaging programs ('Autodialer') that can select random,

sequential, and/or store phone numbers, dial such numbers, and send thousands of unsolicited automated text messages to such numbers." ECI and Brew House purportedly "compiled thousands of cell phone numbers and used the Autodialer to bombard the individuals having such cell phone numbers with special offers, prizes, events, and happy hours via unsolicited text messages." Specifically, named plaintiff Michael Seefeldt takes issue with ECI and Brew House's use of the Autodialer program—between January 24, 2015 and January 24, 2019—to send "unsolicited text messages [to him] and the putative class members promoting specials and events at the Brew House[.]" Seefeldt says these actions are in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. §§ 227, *et seq.*

The TCPA has been the subject of much appellate discourse lately. First, the government-debt exception has been struck down as unconstitutional. *See Am. Assoc. of Political Consultants, Inc. v. F.C.C.*, 923 F.3d 159 (4th Cir. 2019) (striking down the TCPA's government-debt exception as unconstitutional, but severing it); *Duguid v. Facebook, Inc.*, 926 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2019) (striking down the TCPA's government-debt exception as unconstitutional, but severing it). Both the Fourth and Ninth Circuits found that the government-debt exception rendered the TCPA "fatally underinclusive" in that it "does not further the purpose of the automated call ban in a narrowly tailored fashion." *Am. Assoc. of Political Consultants, Inc.*, 923 F.3d at 168; *Duguid*, 926 F.3d at 1155. Both courts severed the government-debt exception while leaving the remainder of the TCPA in place. *Am. Assoc. of Political Consultants, Inc.*, 923 F.3d at 171; *Duguid* 926 F.3d at 1156-1157; *see also* 47 U.S.C. § 608. Their decisions are not without criticism, however, as made clear in the United States' intervening brief. Citing *Brickman v. Facebook, Inc.*, 230 F.Supp.3d 1036, 1047 (N.D. Cal. 2017), the United States argues, apparently on grounds of sovereign immunity, that "[t]he TCPA does not apply to the government"—that is, the TCPA does not impose liability on the government—and thus "the government-debt exception simply acts to protect those who are collecting debts [on its behalf]." As held by the Supreme Court, congress did not waive the government's sovereign immunity in enacting the TCPA, *Campbell-Ewald Co. v. Gomez*, — U.S. —, 136 S.Ct. 663, 672, 193 L.Ed.2d 571 (2016), and a congressional act is required in order for third parties to enjoy the government's immunity by way of the derivative immunity doctrine. *See Yearsley v. W.A. Ross Const. Co.*, 309 U.S. 18, 20, 60 S.Ct. 413, 84 L.Ed. 554 (1940). Neither the court in *Duguid* nor the court in *Am. Assoc. of Political*

*Consultants* contemplated what effect, if any, this sovereign immunity plays in the underinclusiveness rationale. In any event, the Supreme Court will at least look at these criticisms as raised by the United States in *Barr*. See Petition for Writ of Certiorari, Appeal No. 19-631, at pp. 12-13.

\*2 Second, in the wake of the D.C. Circuit’s decision in *ACA Int’l. v. F.C.C.*, 885 F.3d 687, 695 (D.C. Cir. 2018), which essentially reset the TCPA’s definitional landscape, appellate courts have been unable to agree on the exact definition to give to an “autodialer” that lies at the heart of the TCPA’s prohibitive mandates. This is a preliminary issue to the determination of whatever possible exceptions might remain following constitutional scrutiny. The problem comes down to a proper interpretation of Section 227(a)(1)(A), which states that autodialer “equipment” must have the “capacity” to “store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.” 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1)(A) (emphasis added). The latter phrase is what has caused so much confusion. Does the phrase “using a random or sequential number generator” modify the verb “store” or “produce,” or both? The Third, Seventh, and Eleventh Circuits have all concluded that it is both; an autodialer must be capable of either **storing** telephone numbers using a random or sequential number generator **or produce** such numbers using a random or sequential number generator. See *Gadelhak v. AT&T Servs., Inc.*, — F.3d —, 2020 WL 808270 at \*8 (7th Cir. Feb. 19, 2020); *Glasser v. Hilton Grand Vacations Co., LLC.*, 948 F.3d 1301, 1306 (11th Cir. 2020); *Dominquez ex rel. Himself v. Yahoo, Inc.*, 894 F.3d 116, 119 (3d Cir. 2018). They admit, however, that this definition is “imperfect,” *Gadelhak*, — F.3d —, 2020 WL 808270 at \*8, and “runs into [interpretive] hurdles.” *Glasser*, 948 F.3d at 1306. Conversely, the Ninth Circuit has concluded the phrase affects only the word produce, not store, such that an autodialer can either be equipment with the capacity to store numbers, or with the capacity to produce numbers to be called using a random or sequential number generator. *Marks v. Crunch San Diego, LLC.*, 904 F.3d 1041, 1049 (9th Cir. 2018). Apparently, as recognized by the Seventh Circuit, there are at least two other options floated around by the district courts suggesting the definition “captures only equipment that *dials* randomly or sequentially generated numbers” or otherwise “describe[s] the manner in which the telephone numbers are to be *called*, regardless of how they are stored, produced, or generated.” *Gadelhak*, — F.3d —, 2020 WL 808270 at \*4 (emphasis added).

In this case, defendants have filed a Rule 12(b)(6) motion that takes a notably scattershot approach, attacking *both* Section 227(b) and Section 227(c) of the TCPA under no less than the First Amendment Free Speech Clause, the “Fifth Amendment Equal Protection Clause,” and the Fifth Amendment Due Process Clause. But, the government-debt exception issue is certainly front-and-center in their arguments, which now sits before the U.S. Supreme Court in *Barr*. The question in that case, though, is not only whether the government-debt exception is unconstitutional; more importantly, it is also whether the proper remedy was to sever the offending exception from the TCPA, leaving the remainder of the TCPA intact. See Petition for Writ of Certiorari, Appeal No. 19-631, at p. I. In their motion to stay, defendants say these issues, challenging the stability of the TCPA at its core, “risk[ ] inconsistent rulings and otherwise avoidable resources expenditures” in the event this Court decides contrary to the Supreme Court.

This Court finds even more concerning, however, the pending issue of class certification. Plaintiff sought class certification only two months after he filed his case— apparently aided by discovery efforts in substantially similar litigation in the Western District of Missouri. Notably, Judge Harpool in that case recently denied class certification and granted summary judgment to the defendants, in part, because “the platforms [used by Brew House] were not an ATDS under the TCPA.” *Beal v. Outfield Brew House, LLC.*, 2020 WL 618839 at \*5 (W.D. Mo. Feb. 10, 2020) (granting summary judgment in defendants favor, and denying class certification, because plaintiff’s claims could not survive the autodialer definitional adopted by the court). Judge Harpool elected to rely on the autodialer definition of the Third Circuit (and Seventh and Eleventh Circuits), that “an [autodialer] must **produce** numbers to be called **using a random or sequential number generator**.” *Id.* (emphasis added) (quoting *Dominquez*, 894 F.3d at 121). He went on to explain that “[t]he platforms at issue in this case could only text individuals whose numbers had been entered into the system manually – either by importing information from a CSV file or individually typing in the number. **In other words, the system did not generate telephone numbers, it merely stored them** [via manual entry].” *Id.* (emphasis added). Thus, it was concluded, “[t]his does not constitute an [autodialer].” *Id.* It made no difference, he explained, that the “software can ‘randomly-select phone numbers,’ ” because “that is not the same as generating them [randomly].” *Id.*

2020 WL 905844

\*3 With *Beal* in mind, the problem of continuing this case is laid bare: it hinges not only on the problem of the government-debt exception, but also on the definitional problem of what constitutes an autodialer. To be sure, this Court notes plaintiff's complaint seems to specifically rely on the autodialer definition adopted by the Ninth Circuit—that is, an autodialer that can simply “store telephone numbers to be called, regardless of whether those numbers were generated by a random or sequential number generator”—which now sits in a clear appellate minority as against the greater weight of the Third, Seventh, and Eleventh Circuits. Plaintiff's proposed definition was also rejected by the Western District of Missouri. [Doc. #1, P. 5, ¶¶ 21-22]; see also *Gadelhak*, — F.3d —, 2020 WL 808270 at \*4; *Beal*, 2020 WL 618839 at \*5. And, as *Beal* shows, a determination on this issue can swing wildly in either side's favor—resulting, potentially, in summary judgment for the defendants. Compare *Beal*, 2020 WL 618839 at \*5 (granting summary judgment to defendants on the basis that “the system did not generate telephone numbers, it merely stored them”); with *Smith v. Truman Road Development, LLC.*, 414 F.Supp.3d 1205, 1240 (W.D. Mo. 2019) (denying a motion to dismiss by defendants, in part, on the basis that “the systems described in the complaint [are capable of] dial[ing] numbers from a stored list—precisely what is prohibited by the statute”).

At this stage, the Supreme Court has not revealed it hand whether it will also take up review of the definitional problem. See *Facebook, Inc. v. Duguid*, Appeal No. 19-511 (case involving issue of the proper definition of an autodialer that was distributed for conference on January 24, 2020, but is without decision whether to grant certiorari). But, without a doubt, it creates that much more uncertainty about the TCPA at large and, specifically, the viability of plaintiff's claims. Of course, what the Supreme Court *has* accepted review of—particularly, whether the government-debt exception is severable from the TCPA if deemed unconstitutional—risks a potential total collapse of the TCPA without regard to the definitional problem. It seems likely that decision, at minimum, will come this term (oral argument has been set for April 22, 2020), which may or may not be a reason why the decision on certiorari in *Duguid* remains pending.

Whatever the case, having studied the matter carefully, it seems the best approach is to wait for much-needed clarity from the Supreme Court—at least as to the government-debt exception problem, but also potentially the definitional problem. Indeed, this Court's has inherent power to stay proceedings as part of its authority “to control the disposition

of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort [in mind] for itself, for counsel, and for litigants.” *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254, 57 S.Ct. 163, 81 L.Ed. 153 (1936). “How this can best be done calls for the exercise of judgment, which must weigh competing interests and maintain an even balance. *Id.* at 254-255, 57 S.Ct. 163. Generally speaking, the Court is to weigh “the potential prejudice or hardship to the parties, as well as the interest of judicial economy.” *St. Louis Heart Ctr, Inc. v. Athenahealth, Inc.*, 2015 WL 6777873 at \*5 (E.D. Mo. Nov. 4, 2015).

This rubric favors a stay for the benefit of *both* parties, as well as this Court. For starters, plaintiff says it is defendants who have “shown no likelihood of success on the merits.” But, as explained above, *Beal* patently suggests otherwise—defendants won summary judgment in their favor on facts substantially similar to this case. Similarly, plaintiff argues the public interest would be harmed because “land line and cellular telephone lines were being abused” by defendants, which must be stopped. But *Beal* again suggests otherwise, finding the platforms used by Brew House (for the same years at issue, no less) “are not an ATDS under the TCPA.” 2020 WL 618839 at \*5. Plaintiff also says that discovery efforts will be hampered if a stay is entered, such as dealing with the issue of witness memory recall, but ties none of those allegations to the particulars of this case. Again, with a class certification motion already pending, this Court must confront the issue of defining an autodialer at an early stage—soon if a stay is not entered—that may result in the denial of class certification, as occurred in *Beal* following summary judgment, which all but defeats the need for discovery as a practical matter given the severe reduction in damage potential of this case. See 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3) (permitting an action for injunctive relief, actual monetary loss, and/or \$500 in damages per violation). Finally, plaintiff suggests that judicial economy militates against a stay because “this case is still more than year (sic) from final disposition.” Yet, that is precisely why a stay is appropriate, to avoid exhausting judicial resources to decide things like defendants' multifaceted motion to dismiss, plaintiff's pending motion for class certification, and any possible discovery-related matters or summary judgment motions to follow which may prove fruitless. A (relatively) young case, at least from the standpoint of litigation efforts, if not time alone, favors staying this action. See *St. Louis Heart Ctr, Inc.*, 2015 WL 6777873 at \*5 (staying a TCPA action where a Supreme Court decision was pending for, amongst other reasons, the “very young” age of the case that had not yet conducted much discovery and had not yet litigated substantive issues).

2020 WL 905844

\*4 Accordingly,

So ordered this 25th day of February 2020.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that defendants' motion to stay (#93) is **GRANTED**. This Case is **STAYED** pending resolution by the U.S. Supreme Court of *Barr v. American Association of Political Consultants*, Appeal No. 19-631.

**All Citations**

Slip Copy, 2020 WL 905844

---

End of Document

© 2020 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.



2020 WL 1149906

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.  
United States District Court, M.D. Florida,  
Orlando Division.

Bruce WRIGHT, Jorge Valdes  
and Edwin Diaz, Plaintiffs,

v.

EXP REALTY, LLC, Defendant.

Case No. 6:18-cv-1851-Orl-40EJK

Signed 02/07/2020

#### Attorneys and Law Firms

[Stefan Coleman](#), Law Offices of Stefan Coleman, PLLC, [Avi Robert Kaufman](#), Kaufman P.A., Miami, FL, for Plaintiffs.

[Eric Allen](#), Pro Hac Vice, Allen, Mitchell & Allen, PLLC, Salt Lake City, UT, [James P. Gitkin](#), Salpeter Gitkin, LLP, Ft. Lauderdale, FL, [Jason Daniel Joffe](#), Squire Patton Boggs, LLP, Miami, FL, for Defendant.

### ORDER

[PAUL G. BYRON](#), UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*1 This cause comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Stay Proceedings (Doc. 94), filed January 22, 2020. On February 5, 2020, Plaintiffs responded in opposition. (Doc. 96). Upon consideration, Defendant's motion is due to be granted.

#### I. BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs initiated this action on October 30, 2018, and filed their Amended Complaint on January 24, 2019 (Doc. 30), seeking recovery against Defendant under the Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"). On October 25, 2019, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Class Certification (Doc. 68), in an attempt to address what they describe as a "pervasive problem emanating from the real estate industry." (*Id.*). Plaintiffs argue that real estate brokers are violating the TCPA by allowing realtors to: "(1) purchase leads lists of consumers with whom the realtors and the brokerages have no relationship and (2) repeatedly cold calling them to solicit real estate listings using calling platforms that include the ability to autodial and transmit prerecorded voice messages ...." (*Id.*).

Defendant now moves to stay these proceedings pending the Supreme Court's decision in *William P. Barr v. Am. Ass'n Political Consultants Inc., et al.*, Case No. 19-631. (Doc. 94).

#### II. DISCUSSION

District courts have broad discretion to stay proceedings. [Clinton v. Jones](#), 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997). Nevertheless, staying a matter is an extraordinary measure that should only be employed to further the ends of justice, and the district court should resolve any doubts against issuing a stay. *See Bank of Am., N.A. v. Sullivan*, No. 8:13-CV-385, 2013 WL 2285079, at \*2 (M.D. Fla. May 23, 2013).

Defendant asks the Court to stay proceedings pending the Supreme Court's decision in *Barr v. Am. Ass'n Political Consultants* because it has the "potential to moot this action, as the Supreme Court is reviewing whether the statute on which Plaintiff relies – the TCPA – is constitutional." (Doc. 94, p. 1). Plaintiff argues that "[s]imply because eXp hopes the Supreme Court will overturn the Fourth Circuit's decision—and change clear Eleventh Circuit law—does not warrant a stay pending the decision in *Barr*." (Doc. 97, p. 1).

The Court believes that any proceedings before the Supreme Court issues guidance in the upcoming *Barr v. Am. Ass'n* will be—among other things—a waste of judicial resources and a waste of the parties' time and energy. Additionally, "[T]he decision to grant a stay ... is generally left to the sound discretion of district courts." [Ryan v. Gonzales](#), 568 U.S. 57, 74 (2013) (internal quotations and citations omitted).

#### III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that:

1. Defendant's Motion to Stay Proceedings (Doc. 94) is **GRANTED**;
2. On or before **Friday, March 13, 2020**, the parties shall provide the Court with a written status report detailing the upcoming Supreme Court oral argument schedule and/or any updates in the Supreme Court's case and decision.

**DONE AND ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida on February 7, 2020.

**All Citations**

Slip Copy, 2020 WL 1149906

---

**End of Document**

© 2020 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S. Government Works.



**U.S. District Court  
District of Delaware (Wilmington)  
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 1:18-cv-00712-MN**

Perrong v. Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.  
Assigned to: Judge Maryellen Noreika  
Demand: \$15,000,000  
Cause: 28:1331 Fed. Question

Date Filed: 05/11/2018  
Jury Demand: Plaintiff  
Nature of Suit: 890 Other Statutory Actions  
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
05/11/2018	<a href="#"><u>1</u></a>	COMPLAINT filed with Jury Demand against Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. - Magistrate Consent Notice to Pltf. ( Filing fee \$ 400, receipt number 0311-2379918.) - filed by Andrew R. Perrong. (Attachments: # <a href="#"><u>1</u></a> Civil Cover Sheet)(sar) (Entered: 05/11/2018)
05/11/2018	<a href="#"><u>2</u></a>	Notice, Consent and Referral forms re: U.S. Magistrate Judge jurisdiction. (sar) (Entered: 05/11/2018)
05/11/2018		Summons Issued with Magistrate Consent Notice attached as to Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. on 5/11/2018. Requesting party or attorney should pick up issued summons at the Help Desk, Room 4209, or call 302-573-6170 and ask the Clerk to mail the summons to them. (sar) (Entered: 05/11/2018)
05/11/2018	<a href="#"><u>3</u></a>	MOTION for Pro Hac Vice Appearance of Attorney Aytan Y. Bellin, Esquire - filed by Andrew R. Perrong. (Higgins, Mary) (Entered: 05/11/2018)
05/16/2018		Case Assigned to Judge Gregory M. Sleet. Please include the initials of the Judge (GMS) after the case number on all documents filed. (nms) (Entered: 05/16/2018)
05/30/2018	<a href="#"><u>4</u></a>	Return of Service Executed by Andrew R. Perrong. Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. served on 5/15/2018, answer due 6/5/2018. (Higgins, Mary) (Entered: 05/30/2018)
06/01/2018	<a href="#"><u>5</u></a>	STIPULATION To Extend Time to Respond to Complaint re <a href="#"><u>1</u></a> Complaint, <a href="#"><u>4</u></a> Return of Service Executed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 06/01/2018)
06/04/2018		SO ORDERED - re <a href="#"><u>3</u></a> MOTION for Pro Hac Vice Appearance of Attorney Aytan Y. Bellin, Esquire filed by Andrew R. Perrong, <a href="#"><u>5</u></a> Stipulation filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C., Set/Reset Answer Deadlines: Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. answer due 6/19/2018.. Ordered by Judge Gregory M. Sleet on 6/4/2018. (mdb) (Entered: 06/04/2018)
06/05/2018		Pro Hac Vice Attorney Aytan Y. Bellin for Andrew R. Perrong added for electronic noticing. Pursuant to Local Rule 83.5 (d)., Delaware counsel shall be the registered users of CM/ECF and shall be required to file all papers. (fms) (Entered: 06/05/2018)
06/15/2018	<a href="#"><u>6</u></a>	NOTICE of Appearance by Peter S. Murphy on behalf of Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. (Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 06/15/2018)
06/18/2018	<a href="#"><u>7</u></a>	STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME Responsive Pleading to Plaintiff's Complaint to June 26, 2018 - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 06/18/2018)
06/20/2018		SO ORDERED - re <a href="#"><u>7</u></a> STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME Responsive Pleading to Plaintiff's Complaint to June 26, 2018 filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C., Set/Reset Answer Deadlines: Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. answer due 6/26/2018.. Ordered by Judge Gregory M. Sleet on 6/20/2018. (mdb) (Entered: 06/20/2018)

06/26/2018	<a href="#">8</a>	MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Opening Brief in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint, # <a href="#">2</a> Text of Proposed Order, # <a href="#">3</a> Exhibit, # <a href="#">4</a> Notice of Manual filing of Multi-Media Materials)(Murphy, Peter) Modified on 6/27/2018 (mdb). (Entered: 06/26/2018)
06/28/2018	<a href="#">9</a>	ORDER REGARDING CASE MANAGEMENT IN CIVIL CASES. Signed by Judge Gregory M. Sleet on 6/28/2018. (asw) (Entered: 06/28/2018)
06/28/2018	<a href="#">10</a>	NOTICE of Constitutional Question by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. (Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 06/28/2018)
07/10/2018	<a href="#">11</a>	ANSWERING BRIEF in Opposition re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction filed by Andrew R. Perrong.Reply Brief due date per Local Rules is 7/17/2018. (Higgins, Mary) (Entered: 07/10/2018)
07/10/2018	<a href="#">12</a>	Amended ANSWERING BRIEF in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss filed by Andrew R. Perrong.Reply Brief due date per Local Rules is 7/17/2018. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Certificate of Service)(Higgins, Mary) Modified on 7/10/2018 (mdb). (Entered: 07/10/2018)
07/12/2018	<a href="#">13</a>	SUMMONS Returned Executed on July 2, 2018 as to Jefferson Sessions, Attorney General of the United States. (Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 07/12/2018)
07/17/2018	<a href="#">14</a>	STIPULATION and Proposed Order for a One Week Extension to the Deadline for Defendant's Reply Brief re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction, <a href="#">11</a> Answering Brief in Opposition, <a href="#">12</a> Answering Brief in Opposition by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 07/17/2018)
07/19/2018		SO ORDERED - re <a href="#">14</a> Stipulation and Proposed Order for a One Week Extension to the Deadline for Defendant's Reply Brief filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C., Set Briefing Schedule: re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction. (Reply Brief due 7/24/2018). Ordered by Judge Gregory M. Sleet on 7/19/2018. (mdb) (Entered: 07/19/2018)
07/24/2018	<a href="#">15</a>	REPLY BRIEF re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 07/24/2018)
07/30/2018	<a href="#">16</a>	Joint STATUS REPORT by Andrew R. Perrong. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Certification of Counsel)(Higgins, Mary) (Entered: 07/30/2018)
07/30/2018	<a href="#">17</a>	Joint PROPOSED ORDER Proposed Scheduling Order re <a href="#">16</a> Status Report by Andrew R. Perrong. (Higgins, Mary) (Entered: 07/30/2018)
08/21/2018	<a href="#">18</a>	MOTION for Extension of Time to Decide Whether to Intervene (UNOPPOSED) - filed by United States of America. (Hall, Jennifer) Modified on 8/27/2018 (mdb). (Entered: 08/21/2018)
08/27/2018		ORAL ORDER re <a href="#">16</a> Joint Status Report, <a href="#">17</a> Proposed Scheduling Order - The plaintiff shall file an amended proposed scheduling that includes dates certain for all scheduling events. The amended proposal is due no later than Friday, August 31, 2018. Ordered by Judge Gregory M. Sleet on 8/27/2018. (mdb) (Entered: 08/27/2018)
08/27/2018	<a href="#">19</a>	SO ORDERED - re <a href="#">18</a> MOTION for Extension of Time to Decide Whether to Intervene

		(UNOPPOSED) filed by United States of America. Signed by Judge Gregory M. Sleet on 8/27/2018. (mdb) (Entered: 08/27/2018)
08/31/2018	<a href="#">20</a>	Joint PROPOSED ORDER Amended Scheduling Order by Andrew R. Perrong. (Higgins, Mary) (Entered: 08/31/2018)
09/20/2018		Case reassigned to Judge Maryellen Noreika. Please include the initials of the Judge (MN) after the case number on all documents filed. (jcs) (Entered: 09/20/2018)
10/24/2018	<a href="#">21</a>	NOTICE OF SERVICE of Plaintiff's First Sets of Interrogatories, Requests for Admissions, and Requests for Production filed by Andrew R. Perrong.(Higgins, Mary) (Entered: 10/24/2018)
10/26/2018	<a href="#">22</a>	NOTICE of Intervention in Support of the Constitutionality of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 by United States of America (Hall, Jennifer) (Entered: 10/26/2018)
10/26/2018	<a href="#">23</a>	ANSWERING BRIEF in Opposition re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction filed by United States of America.Reply Brief due date per Local Rules is 11/2/2018. (Hall, Jennifer) (Entered: 10/26/2018)
10/30/2018	24	ORAL ORDER re <a href="#">20</a> : IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties shall confer regarding proposed dates in the scheduling order and shall submit a proposed order, including a proposal for the length and timing of trial, to the Court no later than thirty (30) days from the date of this Order. The parties are to use the Courts form scheduling order, which is posted at <a href="http://www.ded.uscourts.gov">http://www.ded.uscourts.gov</a> (see Chambers, Judge Noreika, Forms). If there are disputes or issues that the Court needs to address in the proposed scheduling order, the parties shall direct the Court to the paragraph numbers in which those appear in a cover letter to the Court. ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 10/30/2018. (dlw) (Entered: 10/30/2018)
11/07/2018	<a href="#">25</a>	ORDER re <a href="#">23</a> ANSWERING BRIEF: Defendant and/or Plaintiff may each file a 10-page reply brief in response to the United States' Answering Brief on or before November 14, 2018. If no reply briefs are filed, the Court will decide the Motion to Dismiss <a href="#">8</a> on the papers as submitted. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before November 14, 2018, the parties, or the United States, or both shall advise the Court if the Court should certify the constitutional question in light of the fact that the United States has already intervened (Set Briefing Schedule: Reply Brief(s) due 11/14/2018). SEE ORDER FOR COMPLETE DETAILS. Signed by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 11/7/2018. (dlw) (Entered: 11/07/2018)
11/08/2018	<a href="#">26</a>	Letter to Honorable Maryellen Noreika from Jennifer Hall regarding Response to Order (D.I. 25) - re <a href="#">25</a> Order,,, Set Briefing Schedule,,, (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Hall, Jennifer) (Entered: 11/08/2018)
11/09/2018	<a href="#">27</a>	ORDER Certifying Constitutional Challenge. Signed by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 11/9/2018. (Copy mailed to the United States Attorney General) (dlw) (Entered: 11/09/2018)
11/14/2018	<a href="#">28</a>	REPLY BRIEF re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Murphy, Peter) (Main Document 28 replaced on 11/16/2018) (dlw). (Entered: 11/14/2018)
11/15/2018	<a href="#">29</a>	NOTICE OF SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL re Andrew R. Perrong: Entry of appearance of attorney Chad J. Toms. Attorney Mary Higgins terminated. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Notice and Certificate of Service)(Toms, Chad) (Entered: 11/15/2018)
11/16/2018		CORRECTING ENTRY: The PDF at D.I. 28 has been swapped out with a version of the brief that complies with Local Rule 5.1.1 that all printed matter must be in at least 12 point

		type. (dlw) (Entered: 11/16/2018)
11/20/2018	<a href="#">30</a>	Consent MOTION to Stay re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction, <a href="#">21</a> Notice of Service - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Rule 7.1.1. Statement, # <a href="#">2</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 11/20/2018)
11/21/2018		SO ORDERED re <a href="#">30</a> Consent MOTION to Stay filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. Discovery in this case is STAYED until after a decision on the pending Motion to Dismiss <a href="#">8</a> . ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 11/21/2018. (dlw) (Entered: 11/21/2018)
11/28/2018		Set/Reset Hearings: An Oral Argument is set for 1/10/2019 at 03:00 PM in Courtroom 4A before Judge Maryellen Noreika on the Motion to Dismiss <a href="#">8</a> . The Court is setting aside a total of two hours for the argument. (dlw) (Entered: 11/28/2018)
11/28/2018	<a href="#">31</a>	MOTION to Defer Filing a Scheduling Order (Unopposed) - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Rule 7.1.1. Statement, # <a href="#">2</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Murphy, Peter) Modified on 11/28/2018 (dlw). (Entered: 11/28/2018)
11/29/2018		SO ORDERED re <a href="#">31</a> Consent MOTION - The Scheduling Order currently due today shall be filed no later than thirty (30) days from the Court's ruling on the pending Motion to Dismiss <a href="#">8</a> . ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 11/29/2018. (dlw) (Entered: 11/29/2018)
11/30/2018	<a href="#">32</a>	NOTICE of Appearance by Anjali Motgi on behalf of United States of America (Motgi, Anjali) (Entered: 11/30/2018)
12/21/2018	<a href="#">33</a>	MOTION for Pro Hac Vice Appearance of Attorney Charles A. Zdebski, Esquire - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Certification of Charles A. Zdebski, Esquire, # <a href="#">2</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 12/21/2018)
12/21/2018		SO ORDERED re <a href="#">33</a> MOTION for Pro Hac Vice Appearance of Attorney Charles A. Zdebski, Esquire filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 12/21/2018. (dlw) (Entered: 12/21/2018)
12/26/2018	<a href="#">34</a>	Letter to Honorable Maryellen Noreika, U.S.D.J from Chad J. Toms, Esquire regarding Oral Argument on Defendant Liberty Power Corp.'s pending motion to dismiss - re <a href="#">25</a> Order,,, Set Briefing Schedule,, <a href="#">23</a> Answering Brief in Opposition, 24 Oral Order,,, (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit A, # <a href="#">2</a> Exhibit B, # <a href="#">3</a> Exhibit C, # <a href="#">4</a> Exhibit D)(Toms, Chad) (Entered: 12/26/2018)
12/26/2018	<a href="#">35</a>	MOTION for Pro Hac Vice Appearance of Attorney Robert J. Gastner, Esquire - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Certification of Robert J. Gastner, Esquire, # <a href="#">2</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Murphy, Peter) (Entered: 12/26/2018)
01/02/2019		SO ORDERED re <a href="#">35</a> MOTION for Pro Hac Vice Appearance of Attorney Robert J. Gastner, Esquire filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 1/2/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 01/02/2019)
01/03/2019	<a href="#">36</a>	MOTION to Stay Case in Light of Lapse of Appropriations - UNOPPOSED - filed by United States of America. (Hall, Jennifer) Modified on 1/3/2019 (dlw). (Entered: 01/03/2019)
01/03/2019	<a href="#">37</a>	ORDER GRANTING <a href="#">36</a> Motion to Stay. Case STAYED. The January 10, 2019 Oral Argument is CANCELED. Signed by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 1/3/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 01/03/2019)
01/11/2019	<a href="#">38</a>	NOTICE OF SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL re Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.: Entry of



		appearance of attorney Alexandra Rogin. Attorney Peter S. Murphy, Esquire terminated. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Certificate of Service of Notice of Substitution of Counsel)(Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 01/11/2019)
01/28/2019	<a href="#">39</a>	NOTICE of Restoration of Appropriations by United States of America re <a href="#">37</a> Order on Motion to Stay (Hall, Jennifer) Modified on 1/29/2019 (dlw). (Entered: 01/28/2019)
02/21/2019	40	ORAL ORDER LIFTING STAY and Setting Oral Argument on <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss - Oral Argument is set for 5/10/2019 at 10:00 AM in Courtroom 4A before Judge Maryellen Noreika. The Court has set aside two hours for argument. ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 2/21/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 02/21/2019)
04/01/2019	41	ORAL ORDER: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, on or before April 30, 2019, each party shall submit a letter to the Court identifying any district court or appellate court opinions issuing since November 14, 2018 that have addressed the constitutionality of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991, 47 U.S.C. § 227. For each case identified, a party may include up to three sentences explaining the relevance of the opinion to the present case. There will be no reply submissions. ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 4/1/19. (dlw) (Entered: 04/01/2019)
04/01/2019	<a href="#">42</a>	NOTICE of Appearance by Laura D. Hatcher on behalf of United States of America (Hatcher, Laura) (Entered: 04/01/2019)
04/30/2019	<a href="#">43</a>	Letter to Judge Noreika from Chad J. Toms regarding Constitutionality of the TCPA - re 41 Oral Order,, (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit Exhibits A-C)(Toms, Chad) (Entered: 04/30/2019)
04/30/2019	<a href="#">44</a>	Letter to Judge Noreika from Alexandra D. Rogin regarding Constitutionality of the TCPA - re 41 Oral Order,, (Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 04/30/2019)
04/30/2019	<a href="#">45</a>	Letter to the Court from the United States regarding Decisions About the Constitutionality of the TCPA Since Nov. 14, 2018. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit A, # <a href="#">2</a> Exhibit B, # <a href="#">3</a> Exhibit C)(Motgi, Anjali) (Entered: 04/30/2019)
05/10/2019		Minute Entry for proceedings held before Judge Maryellen Noreika - Oral Argument held on 5/10/2019 re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. The court will take this matter under advisement and issue an Order in due course. (Court Reporter: Dale Hawkins.) (asw) (Entered: 05/10/2019)
05/16/2019	<a href="#">46</a>	NOTICE of Withdrawal of Attorney, Jennifer L. Hall by United States of America (Hall, Jennifer) (Entered: 05/16/2019)
06/21/2019	<a href="#">47</a>	Letter to Honorable Maryellen Noreika, U.S.D.J. from Chad J. Toms regarding Perrong v. Liberty Power Corp., 1:18-cv-712 (MN) Decision issued by the Ninth Circuit relevant to pending Motion to Dismiss - re <a href="#">8</a> MOTION to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Upon Which Relief Can be Granted and Partial Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Enclosure)(Toms, Chad) (Entered: 06/21/2019)
09/30/2019	<a href="#">48</a>	MEMORANDUM OPINION. Signed by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 9/30/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 09/30/2019)
09/30/2019	<a href="#">49</a>	ORDER re <a href="#">48</a> Memorandum Opinion DENYING <a href="#">8</a> Defendant's motion to dismiss. Signed by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 9/30/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 09/30/2019)
10/09/2019	<a href="#">50</a>	MOTION for Extension of Time to File Answer with Consent of Plaintiff - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Text of Proposed Order, # <a href="#">2</a> Rule 7.1.1 Statement) (Rogin, Alexandra) Modified on 10/9/2019 (dlw). (Entered: 10/09/2019)

10/09/2019		SO ORDERED re <a href="#">50</a> MOTION for Extension of Time to File Answer with Consent of Plaintiff (Set/Reset Answer Deadlines: Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. answer due 10/28/2019). ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 10/9/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 10/09/2019)
10/28/2019	<a href="#">51</a>	ANSWER to <a href="#">1</a> Complaint with Jury Demand by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C..(Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 10/28/2019)
10/30/2019	<a href="#">52</a>	REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 10/30/2019)
10/30/2019	<a href="#">53</a>	OPENING BRIEF in Support re <a href="#">52</a> REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C..Answering Brief/Response due date per Local Rules is 11/13/2019. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit A)(Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 10/30/2019)
10/30/2019	<a href="#">54</a>	MOTION to Stay Proceedings - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Rogin, Alexandra) Modified on 10/31/2019 (dlw). (Entered: 10/30/2019)
11/07/2019	<a href="#">55</a>	NOTICE of Defendant's Notice of Supplemental Authority by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. (Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 11/07/2019)
11/07/2019	<a href="#">56</a>	PROPOSED ORDER // Scheduling Order by Andrew R. Perrong. (Toms, Chad) Modified on 11/7/2019 (dlw). (Entered: 11/07/2019)
11/13/2019	<a href="#">57</a>	STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME for Plaintiff to File Response to Defendant's Motions to Amend Order Denying Motion to Dismiss and to Certify Interlocutory Appeal and to Stay Proceedings to November 27, 2019 - filed by Andrew R. Perrong. (Toms, Chad) Modified on 11/13/2019 (dlw). (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/13/2019		SO ORDERED re <a href="#">57</a> STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME for Plaintiff to File Response to Defendant's Motions to Amend Order Denying Motion to Dismiss and to Certify Interlocutory Appeal and to Stay Proceedings to November 27, 2019 (Set Briefing Schedule: re <a href="#">54</a> MOTION to Stay Proceedings, <a href="#">52</a> REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals - Answering Briefs due 11/27/2019). ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 11/13/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/13/2019	<a href="#">58</a>	MEMORANDUM in Opposition re <a href="#">52</a> REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals filed by United States of America.Reply Brief due date per Local Rules is 11/20/2019. (Motgi, Anjali) (Main Document 58 replaced on 11/13/2019) (dlw). (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/13/2019		CORRECTING ENTRY: The last page of D.I. 58 has been deleted per the request of counsel as it was attached in error. (dlw) (Entered: 11/13/2019)
11/18/2019	<a href="#">59</a>	Joint STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME to file Reply Brief to December 6, 2019 - filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 11/18/2019)
11/19/2019		SO ORDERED re <a href="#">59</a> Joint STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME to file Reply Brief to December 6, 2019 (Set Briefing Schedule: re <a href="#">52</a> REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals - Reply Brief due 12/6/2019). IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the reply brief shall not exceed 20 pages. ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 11/19/2019. (dlw) (Entered: 11/19/2019)
11/27/2019	<a href="#">60</a>	ANSWERING BRIEF in Opposition re <a href="#">54</a> MOTION to Stay Proceedings, <a href="#">52</a> REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals filed by Andrew R.

		Perrong. Reply Brief due date per Stipulation is 12/6/2019. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit A) (Toms, Chad) Modified on 12/2/2019 (dlw). (Entered: 11/27/2019)
12/06/2019	<a href="#">61</a>	REPLY BRIEF re <a href="#">54</a> MOTION to Stay Proceedings, <a href="#">52</a> REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals filed by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C.. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit A-D to Reply Brief)(Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 12/06/2019)
12/16/2019	<a href="#">62</a>	NOTICE OF SUBSTITUTION OF COUNSEL re United States of America: Entry of appearance of attorney Jonathan D Kossak. Attorney Anjali Motgi terminated. (Kossak, Jonathan) (Entered: 12/16/2019)
01/14/2020	<a href="#">63</a>	Letter to The Hon. Maryellen Noreika from Alexandra Rogin regarding Supreme Court Case Development - re <a href="#">53</a> Opening Brief in Support, <a href="#">54</a> MOTION to Stay Proceedings, <a href="#">52</a> REQUEST for Certification of Direct Appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals , <a href="#">55</a> Notice (Other), <a href="#">61</a> Reply Brief,. (Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 01/14/2020)
02/24/2020	64	ORAL ORDER Setting Teleconference: A Telephone Conference is set for 3/6/2020 at 10:00 AM before Judge Maryellen Noreika regarding the pending motions (D.I. <a href="#">52</a> , <a href="#">54</a> ). Any party wishing to join the call shall do so by <i>individually</i> dialing into 302-573-4545. ORDERED by Judge Maryellen Noreika on 2/24/2020. (dlw) (Entered: 02/24/2020)
03/03/2020	<a href="#">65</a>	NOTICE of Supplemental Authority for Motion to Stay by Liberty Power Corp, L.L.C. re <a href="#">54</a> MOTION to Stay Proceedings, <a href="#">63</a> Letter, (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit)(Rogin, Alexandra) (Entered: 03/03/2020)
03/06/2020		Minute Entry for proceedings held before Judge Maryellen Noreika - Telephone Conference held on 3/6/2020. The pending motions ( <a href="#">52</a> , <a href="#">54</a> ) are DENIED. The case is STAYED pending the outcome of the U.S. Supreme Court case <i>Barr v. American Association of Political Consultants</i> . The parties shall file a joint status report within two weeks of the conclusion of the <i>Barr</i> case. CASE STAYED. (Court Reporter Dale Hawkins.) (mdb) (Entered: 03/06/2020)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
03/23/2020 13:07:05			
PACER Login:	cmerrick:4360201:0	Client Code:	030232-0001
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	1:18-cv-00712-MN Start date: 1/1/2017 End date: 3/23/2020
Billable Pages:	6	Cost:	0.60